

WNYX-TV

COVERING NEW YORK CITY AND L.I.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MM Doc. No. 87-268

FAXRECEIVED
NOV 30 1995TO: BOB ECKER
FCCFEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

FROM: RICHARD DOBNER

DATE: Oct-24, 1995

NO. PGS. THREE (3) (INCL THIS PAGE)

Bob,

for whatever it's worth, here
is my proposal!

Dick B.

ISLAND BROADCASTING COMPANY
OFFICE: 4 HUNTERS LA. ROSLYN NY 11576
516-627-5103 FAX 516-627-4469
STUDIO: 23 ST. & PARK AVE. NYC 212-475-1550

The "Second channel" myth (p.1 of 2)

In view of current developments concerning the use of a second channel by all TV stations for conversion to HDTV (ATV), it has become even more necessary to question whether it is, or is not, an absolute "given" that conversion can be accomplished in no other way. A very potent argument can be made for achieving a change to all digital TV without use of a second channel - by simply picking a given date, and all stations converting on that date, using their present transmitter, antenna & channel. Consider:

- 1) Towers, or tower space, is unavailable in many areas due primarily to current concerns about radiation etc.
- 2) Manufacture of 1400 + new transmitters, transmitting antennas, transmission line etc. cannot be done quickly.
- 3) Experienced installation crews are even now scarce.
- 4) Delays & high costs due to lements by many parties are certain, especially if broadcasters are permitted multiple ATV channel use.
- 5) There is still much dispute about the best ATV system, and many groups & individuals consider this very premature.
- 6) The need to find 6 MHz non-interfering for every TV station is eliminated, (and apparently cannot be done anyway).
- 7) The government can immediately auction off the big unused part of the UHF spectrum, but only the noninterfering part need be used now. (After ATV conversion, additional spectrum can be sold)
- 8) There will now be no need to eliminate those TV channels allocated for NTSC but not yet used, or to eliminate LPN translator channels.
- 9) By the conversion date chosen, everyone receiving over the air TV would either have a new NTSC/ATV switchable TV, or a cheap set to come (probably under \$100, more likely under \$50 in large quantities).

The Second Channel" myth (P.2 of 2)

- 10) cable, DBS, Telcos, mmos et al will have many choices for their conversion, & won't have to fund both channels, (ie. NTSC and AT&T for each TV station), to subscribers.
- 11) The best AT&T system and broadcasting plan can be chosen, and be compatible with film, computer, etc.
- 12) The cost to the country, and to broadcasters, will be very, very, much lower - in fact there is serious doubt that we can afford the current plan of scrapping billions in hardware.
- 13) If TV stations decide to use compression to offer multiple channel or other services, there will be no claim of "spectrum stealing".
- 14) An all UHF system was never really possible - some V's are a must for AT&T, and there are thousands of UHF translators & PTV's
- 15) The very real probability that broadcasters will try everything to keep both channels is eliminated.
- 16) A set-top box would probably be needed anyway, even with the present plan, for multiple channel AT&T.

I suggest Jan. 1, 2000 as the date to start twenty first century television, and about one year from now to hold the 100 billion dollar plus auction of unused UHF TV spectrum!

We must rethink the AT&T conversion plan based on current facts!

R.D. Boggs
May 1, 1995